UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/591,100 | 10/25/2006 | Immanuel Straub | 516/12 | 6349 |
| 27538 GIBSON & DE | 7590 05/20/201 RNIER LLP | EXAMINER | | |
| 900 ROUTE 9 I | | EASTWOOD, DAVID C | | |
| SUITE 504 WOODBRIDG | E, NJ 07095 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 3731 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 05/20/2010 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | Applicant(s) | | |
|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--|--|
| 10/591,100 | STRAUB, IMMANU | STRAUB, IMMANUEL | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | | |
| David Eastwood | 3731 | | | |

| | David Eastwood | 3731 | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the | correspondence add | ress | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 10 May 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP | | | | | | | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance | t, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; o | vhich places the r (3) a Request | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date | of the final rejection. | | | | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. | | | | | | | |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). | | | | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi | of the fee. The appropri- nally set in the final Office | ate extension fee be action; or (2) as | | | | |
| | liance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be | filed within two month | s of the date of | | | | |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). | | | | | | | |
| <u>AMENDMENTS</u> | | | | | | | |
| The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor | nsideration and/or search (see NO | | cause | | | | |
| (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belowed) (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in betometers. | • | ducina or cimplifyina t | ha issues for | | | | |
| appeal; and/or | ter form for appear by materially re- | ducing or simplifying t | le issues ioi | | | | |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | corresponding number of finally reje | ected claims. | | | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 | 21. See attached Notice of Non-Co | mpliant Amendment (| PTOL-324). | | | | |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | (| · · · · - · /· | | | | |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). | | timely filed amendmer | nt canceling the | | | | |
| For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov | | l be entered and an e | xplanation of | | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>26-49</u> . | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea | al and/or appellant fail | s to provide a | | | | |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. | | | | | | | |
| REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | | | | | | | |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> | | | | | | | |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other: | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | | | | | |
| /(Jackie) Tan-Uyen T. Ho/ | /D. E./ | | | | | | |
| Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3773 | Examiner, Art Unit 3731 5/12/2010 | | | | | | |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Examiner would like to initially note with regard to Applicant's arguments directed to the Examiners interpretation of certain words in the claims that it has been held that during examination, the claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow. In re American Academy of Science Tech Center, 367 F.3d 1359, 1369, 70 USPQ2d 1827, 1834 (Fed. Cir. 2004). See also MPEP 2111.01 [R-5]. In the instant case Applicant has Alleged that the prior art of record fails to disclose an end wall capping the cylindrical bore at the distal end of the working head citing that the definition of the word cap as cited by the examiner is inconsistent with Applicants interpretation of the claim language. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicants assertions. The term cap as defined in the office action merely recites a position of an element, therefore when describing a series of elements and their positional relationship relative to one another it would be completely reasonable to state that the distal end wall of element 14 is capping or positioned at the distal end of the cylindrical bore. The term "capping" is reciting a position of an element in relation to other elements and does not impose a structural limitation on the claim but merely the position of a structure within the claimed device, see definition of the word cap as provided on page 3 of the outstanding office action.

Applicant goes on to proffer that there exists no hole in said end wall. As can be clearly seen in the Straub et al. reference particularly fig.

Applicant goes on to proffer that there exists no hole in said end wall. As can be clearly seen in the Straub et al. reference particularly fig. 7, the capping end of element 14 is open and thus comprises a hole in said end wall.

Applicant further alleges that the disclosure of Straub et al. fails to disclose that a distal end of the transport screw abuts said end wall and that the flexible transport screw has a distal end configured to rotate relative to said end wall. The Examiner again respectfully disagrees. The term abut is defined as "to be adjacent to; border on; end at". (abut. (n.d.). Dictionary.com Unabridged. Retrieved May 12, 2010, from Dictionary.com website: http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/abut) As can be clearly seen in at least figures 6 and 7 element 32 is at least adjacent to element 14 if not in contact with since element 32 lies within element 14 and therefore "abuts" the aforementioned end wall of element 14. Furthermore, the Straub reference clearly states in C4 L1-15 that element 32 and rotor 16 are fixed to one another and rotate relative to end wall element 14 therefore flexible transport screw element 32 rotates relative to the end wall portion of element 14. Applicant goes on to state that the Straub reference fails to disclose that the flexible transport screw has "sharp" edges. The word "sharp" is defined as "terminating in an edge or point; not blunt or rounded" (sharp. (n.d.). Dictionary.com Unabridged. Retrieved May 12, 2010, from Dictionary.com website: http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/sharp) As can be clearly seen in fig. 8 the flexible transport screw has a rectangular cross-section whose perimeter surfaces terminate in an edge. see fig. 8 and cross-section of element 32 denoted 32c.